

The Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

Mr. JAMES B. LLOYD is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1854.

INTERVENTION AND NON-INTERVENTION.

"The Abolitionists ask Congress to interfere in the Territories; they demand that the agent should usurp what belongs to the principal—that the representative should override the people, and assume that power which belongs to them alone. This is their aristocratic and inconsistent attitude—these apostles of equality—these oracles of human freedom. Well does the Hon. J. C. Allen, of Illinois, in his forcible and fearless speech on this question, on the 21st instant, exclaim: 'It is in vain for gentlemen to reconcile the two principles. They are either for the one or the other—for Intervention or Non-Intervention.' The bill of Senator Douglas is based upon the doctrine of Non-Intervention."

The foregoing extract, from one of the most unscrupulous advocates of the Nebraska Bill before the Senate, is a fair specimen of the dishonest tactics of the Pro-Slavery men. We assert that the question is not one involving the principle of Popular Sovereignty; there is no issue between the friends and enemies of the right of self-government: the Anti-Slavery men are not opponents of the principle of Popular Sovereignty, nor are the Pro-Slavery men its supporters. The question does not lie between Intervention and Non-Intervention. The Administration, Mr. Douglas, and the Southern Party, are no more in favor of Non-Intervention, than "the Abolitionists," and it is false to say that "his Bill is based upon the doctrine of Non-Intervention." On the contrary, the Bill is founded upon the doctrine of Intervention.

It assumes that the people or inhabitants of a Territory have no original power of self-government; it organizes them, and delegates this power to them, in a limited degree. It does not recognize their right to form their own Government; it proscribes to them the Constitution of their Government. It determines who shall vote, how they shall vote, when they shall vote; how many and what offices there shall be, what shall be the salaries, who shall be eligible, and how long shall be the tenure of office. It denies to them the power to choose their own Judges, their own Governors, their own Secretaries of State, vesting the appointment of these functionaries in the President of the United States, and securing to the Governor the veto prerogative, and to the Congress of the United States the right to revise the acts of the Territorial Legislature. From beginning to end, the Bill is a wholesale denial of the doctrine of Non-Intervention, and a virtual affirmation that the inhabitants of a Territory have not the inherent, original right of self-government, in their Territorial condition.

And yet, the Boston Post, New Hampshire Patriot, Ohio Statesman, and other unprincipled journals, pretend that the Bill fully embodies the principle of Non-Intervention, recognizes and respects Popular Sovereignty, and that its opponents are enemies of the People, enemies of the glorious doctrine of self-government, aristocrats and monarchists at heart!

They shall not deceive the People, if we can help it; they shall not draw off attention from the real issue presented by the Bill. This issue is, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, for the purpose of giving Slavery an opportunity to appropriate to its own base use whatever it can of the free West and Northwest, and for the purpose of establishing a Policy in pursuance of which the area of slave labor on our Southern and Southwestern borders may be expanded without let or hindrance. The only Non-Intervention which the Bill sanctions and provides for, is Non-Intervention by Congress or the Territorial Legislature against Slavery.

Last Saturday, we exposed the double-dealing of the so-called Democratic politicians of the North and South on this point—the Northern section proclaiming that, by the terms of the Bill, the People of a Territory, through their Legislature, would have the right to exclude Slavery; the Southern section insisting that the Bill does not, and cannot, give any such power to the Legislature. As Mr. Douglas has intimated his purpose to press the measure to a final vote next Wednesday, we again solicit attention to this matter. There is honor even among thieves: do these Northern and Southern Slavery confederates intend to cheat each other? Is there no honor in the Senate of the United States? Messrs. Butler, Brown, and other Southern Senators, support the Bill, on the ground that it opens the Territory of Nebraska to Slavery, and gives no power to the Territorial Legislature to exclude it or legislate against it; so-called Northern Democratic Senators support it, on the ground that, although it leaves the Territory unprotected by Congressional enactment against Slavery, it secures to the Territorial Legislature power to exclude it. The former view is industriously disseminated at the South, the latter at the North. And the Senators who propose to pass this two-faced, double-tongued measure, are all honorable men! They know that, were they to adopt an amendment, determining the phraseology of the Bill, so that it should honestly mean but one thing—either that the Territorial Legislature would have power to exclude Slavery, or would have no such power—the Bill could not go through the Senate. Affirm the existence of the power, and the Southern Senators would vote against the Bill; deny its existence, and Northern Senators would not dare support it. And yet, with their eyes wide open to this fact, Senators, being of course all honorable men, intend to force this Janus-faced measure through Congress!

What do the People think of this exhibition of legislative honor and fair dealing? We intend that they shall have light upon this subject. They shall see the fraud, if they cannot prevent it.

"Power to regulate their domestic institutions, subject to the Constitution of the United States!" This is the fraud. The Constitution of the United States carries Slavery into United States Territory, and Territorial legislation against it is unconstitutional. This is the Southern doctrine. It was asserted a few days since, by Messrs. Brown and Hunter. It

is asserted by the Southern press. It was asserted in 1848 and 1850 by Southern statesmen throughout the controversies of those years. In 1848, Mr. Calhoun indignantly scouted the idea that the People of Oregon had the right to prohibit Slavery; and he argued that the sovereignty of the Territories, prior to the organization of a regular State Government, resides "in the People of the several and respective States of the Confederacy." In his famous speech, made March 4th, 1850, he said:

"In claiming the right for the inhabitants, instead of Congress, to legislate for the Territories, the Executive proviso assumes that the sovereignty over the Territories is vested in the former; or, to express it in language used by a resolution offered by one of the Senators from Texas, (General Houston,) have 'the same inherent right of self-government as the People in the States.' The assumption is utterly unfounded, unconstitutional, without example, and contrary to the entire practice of the Government, from its commencement to the present time, as I shall proceed to show."

Mr. Westcott, of Florida, following on the same side, said:

"The people of a Territory," said Mr. Westcott, of Florida, in a most elaborate argument on this question, "by which I mean those recognized as citizens of the Territory, residing in such Territory, cannot exercise any of the sovereign powers that pertain to a sovereign and independent State, except such as are absolutely necessary to the preservation of the peace and good order of society." "Until they form and organize their sovereign State Government, their rights of sovereignty are dormant and in abeyance." "Yes, sir, this thing you call and call a Territorial Government, is a mere temporary, fugacious, local police institution—a limited, dependent, municipal corporation, similar to those existing in counties, cities, parishes, towns, or boroughs, incorporated by our State Legislatures." "The institution of domestic servitude is a political institution; it is not a mere municipal regulation."

Such was the doctrine of Col. JEFFERSON DAVIS, now a member of the present Administration, and committed to the support of the Bill before the Senate. He repudiates the existence of "popular sovereignty" in the People of a Territory, and denied their right to legislate for the exclusion of Slavery. This is a matter of record. In 1850, the following portion of the 10th section of the Bill being under consideration—

"That the legislative power of said Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistently with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act; but no law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposal of the soil, or to introduce or exclude African Slavery."

Col. Davis moved the Provision,

"That nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to prevent said Territorial Legislature from passing such laws as may be necessary for the protection of the right of property of every kind which may have been, or may be hereafter, conformable to the Constitution of the United States, held in or introduced into said Territory."

The meaning of the Provision was this. It was contended by Northern Senators, and by Messrs. Clay and Benton, that the Mexican law, prohibiting Slavery, continued in force in the Territories. Under such circumstances, it was proposed to exclude all action *pro or con* on the subject, by the Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas was in favor of that course. Mr. Davis seemed willing to assent to this; but only on condition of the adoption of a Provision, that, by recognizing the existence of Slavery in the Territories, in virtue of the Constitution of the United States, would virtually supersede the Mexican Law, or affirm their invalidity. "The right of property of any kind" was held or introduced into the Territory, conformably to the Constitution of the United States; was simply a circumlocutory phrase for Slavery. The sentiment embodied in this form of expression is of course held by Colonel Davis now, and he finds nothing repugnant to it in the 14th section of the Nebraska Bill, which proposes to leave the People of the Territory free to regulate their own domestic concerns, "subject to the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. Douglas rather regretted the introduction of the clause in the Compromise Bill, which Mr. Davis sought to amend. In reply to him, Mr. Davis said:

"The difference between that Senator and myself consists in, who are a People? The Senator says that the inhabitants of a Territory have a right to decide what their institutions shall be. When? By what authority? How many of them? Does the Senator tell me, as he said once before, from the authority of God? These men go into a Territory, and establish the fundamental law for all time to come. * * * That is the doctrine, carried to its fullest extent. I claim, that a People, having sovereignty over a Territory, have power to decide what their institutions shall be. * * * The difference, then, between the Senator from Illinois and myself, is the point at which the People do possess and may assert this right. It is not the inhabitants of the Territory, but the People, as a political body, the People organized, who have this right, and, on becoming a State, by the authority of the United States, exercising authority over the Territory, they may establish a fundamental law for all time to come."

These are the opinions of Mr. Davis now. He is a member of the Administration—a bold, determined man, always consistent in his pro-slavery creed. The Administration sustains the Nebraska Bill. Mr. Davis is earnest in its support. It is fair to presume, that the Administration, of which he is a prominent member, understands the Bill, and understands too, that it is in harmony with Southern opinion.

Now let us see what the Southern Press says. Its voice is concurrent with that of Southern Senators.

The Charleston Mercury thus rebukes the Boston Post and its confederates, for the false construction they put upon the Bill and the speech of Mr. Douglas:

"The Boston Post, in commenting upon this gentleman's (Mr. Douglas's) recent speech, makes much pleasure in finding, at length, its favorite doctrine of 'squatter sovereignty,' or the right of the people of the Territory to legislate absolutely upon all local subjects, and thereby to exclude Slavery, fully maintained and vindicated. We cannot assent to any such construction of the speech, and of the bill which it sustains, without imputing duplicity to the former and an unconstitutional character to the latter. For if it is intended to be argued by Senator Douglas, that in creating Territorial Governments invested with the usual powers, they can legislate so as to exclude and abolish Slavery, when the very law which organizes them declares the Territories open to the immigration and settlement of the slaveholder, we must reject such a proposition, as not only un-

constitutional, but as containing upon its very face the mark of treachery."

The next extract we submit is from the South Side Democrat, published at Petersburg, Virginia. It is a comment on the amendment introduced by Senator Chase, affirming the power of the People of a Territory to prohibit Slavery, if they see fit. The Richmond Enquirer republishes it, with the remark that "the insidious and mischievous character of Mr. Chase's movement is admirably exposed" in it. Let the editors of the Ohio Statesman, Cleveland Plaindealer, New Hampshire Patriot, Boston Post, and other papers of the class, read it, ponder it, and hang their heads with shame, for the base fraud they are engaged, wittingly or unwittingly, in imposing upon the Northern People.

"This proposition, divested of its Abolition paternity, comes to us dressed in a plausible garb. But it is plausible only, and is at war with the doctrine of non-intervention upon which the bill before Congress rests. It is the ridiculous vagary of a 'squatter sovereignty' recognized in its most intense essence. Look at it."

"The Constitution empowers Congress to make all needful rules and regulations for the Territories. In accordance with this power, a bill is now before Congress for the organization of Nebraska and Kansas—prescribing a chart to regulate the action of their Territorial Governments. The powers of the Territorial Legislatures, from the nature of the case, being clearly and exclusively derivative, they can exercise no power with which Congress has no authority to invest them. The principle upon which the theory of Congressional non-intervention with Slavery in the Territories is supported, is a denial that Congress is clothed with any power by the Constitution to interfere with their domestic institutions, and that such an intermeddling would not only be a breach of that compact, but alike violative of the equality of the States, by restricting some of them from an enjoyment of their institutions in Territories, the common property of all. This view of the powers of Congress is maintained almost universally at the South, and by a large portion of the States' Rights Democracy at the North."

"The amendment of Senator Chase is plainly in the teeth of this doctrine. It asserts the unheard-of proposition that Congress can exert in its prescription of authority to a Territorial Legislature a derivative power, which it had no primitive right to grant. It lays down the novel theory that an agent, possessing no right himself, can sub-let the authority which he is forbidden by his contract from exercising. The Legislature in the Territories passes in obedience, not to the chart of the Constitution, but powers prescribed by Congress, and nothing can be plainer than that the former have no right to do what is prohibited to the latter."

"There is no analogy between the condition of the Territory in pupillage and the Territory which has fulfilled the requirements of the Constitution, and is prepared to enter the Union as a State. In the latter case, the Territory is the chrysalis. It is regulating its internal affairs with the expectation of admission into the Confederacy as a sovereign co-partner. It enjoys the same conditional rights to regulate its domestic institutions as a State. To introduce or abolish Slavery is an attribute of sovereignty. The Federal Government is not sovereign, except in a range of clearly defined powers and incidents, of which authority to legislate on the subject of Slavery is not one, and consequently it has no right to vest in Territorial legislation, organized under its supervision, any such power."

"When the Territory is ready to ask admission, its people are clothed with inchoate sovereignty, and by virtue of it may prompt their representatives in convention to inhibit or establish Slavery. On applying for admission, Congress can refuse it unconditionally, but has no power to make any other condition, saying that it shall present a republican form of Government. When admission is granted, the sovereignty of the Territory becomes perfected, and the rights exercised by virtue of it are given full force and effect. When the application is refused, the Territory is thrown back into pupillage, and the rights exercised by virtue of like inchoate sovereignty rendered inoperative and void. This, as we understand it, is the true constitutional theory respecting the Territories. It is the only one, in our judgment, consistent with that instrument and the equality of the States."

"The proposition of Senator Chase is the Wilnot Provision, only in a more insidious and dangerous form. It comes habited in a change of costume, but it is by no means difficult to recognize under its false old enemy. Southern Senators should meet it at once."

Now, let the People of the North watch the proceedings of the Senate. That amendment of Mr. Chase, affirming a power in the Territorial Legislature, on the recognition of which the Northern advocates of the Bill rely as a justification of their support of it, will be voted down by the Southern Senators and their Northern confederates, in conformity to the views and policy of the foregoing extract.

SHAMEFUL MISREPRESENTATION.

Designing demagogues misrepresent the features of the Nebraska Bill, by asserting that it contains Pro-Slavery provisions and powers. Such is not the case, and on that point we disprove the falsehoods by the bill itself.

The 21st section is as follows:

"That in order to avoid all misconception, it is hereby declared to be the true intent and meaning of this act, so far as the question of Slavery is concerned, to carry into practical operation the following propositions and principles, established by the Compromise measures of 1850, to wit:—

"That all questions pertaining to Slavery in the Territories, and in the new States to be formed therefrom, are to be left to the decision of the people residing therein, through their appropriate representatives."

"Second. That 'all cases involving titles to slaves' and 'questions of personal freedom' are referred to the adjudication of the local tribunals, with the right of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States."

"Third. That the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States, in respect to fugitives from service, are to be carried into faithful execution in all the organized Territories, the same as in the States."

The foregoing is from the Zanesville (O.) Aurora of the 22d inst., and is going the round of the papers in the West, in favor of the Nebraska Bill. The section quoted is the famous one said to have been omitted in the first printing of the original Bill, owing to a clerical error. It then appeared as a part of the Bill, but was stricken out of the substitute Bill, that one now pending, for the very reason that the slaveholders would not consent to leave the subject of Slavery to the decision of the People, either as represented in Congress or in the Territorial Legislature. We have repeatedly called attention to this misrepresentation, and it was fully exposed in the speech of Senator Chase; but it is still persisted in, and will be, by the pro-slavery men. We repeat, this section is not in the Bill. We doubt whether the history of

legislation in this country furnishes a parallel to the abominable game of deception now attempted upon the People.

SENATORIAL BALLOTINGS IN OHIO.

The Legislature of Ohio finds some difficulty in electing a Senator. Nineteen ballotings have already been had, without a choice. On the first and the last ballot the vote stood as follows:

First ballot—Allen 39, Manypenny 28, Pugh 13, Corwin 11, Birchard 2, Bartley 0.

Nineteenth ballot—Allen 38, Manypenny 0, Pugh 13, Corwin 3, Birchard 0, Bartley 39.

The highest for Bartley, at any time, was 40. We trust that there may be public spirit enough in the Legislature to prevent the election of any man, not openly and firmly committed against the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

If the spirit of Liberty could at this crisis rise above the bondage of Party, the present Senator from that State, who has distinguished himself by his noble efforts in behalf of Free Labor interests, and vindicated the fundamental principles of civil liberty as cherished by the People of Ohio, would be promptly re-elected.

STATE CONVENTION IN OHIO TO OPPOSE THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

We learn that this Convention will meet on the 22d of March, instead of the 8th, as was at first proposed. This will afford plenty of time for a full rally of the friends of Freedom.

CONGRESS.

In the Senate to-day ample evidence was given that THE PEOPLE are alive to a sense of their rights, with respect to the attempted Slavery extension. Bills were freely passed, granting land to the States, for railroad and other purposes. Mr. Chase also presented his views at length on the Nebraska bill.

In the House, it was decided to elect a Printer on Wednesday, at 2 P. M. The Senate bill authorizing the building of six steam frigates, was ruled to come up for consideration on Tuesday and Wednesday of the week after next. An ineffectual effort was also made to again bring before the House the contest of General Lane for the seat as delegate of New Mexico, now occupied by Mr. Gallegos.

THE McDONOUGH WILL CASE.—The opinion of the United States Supreme Court in this case was to-day pronounced by Justice Campbell, sustaining the will. Interests to the amount of from five to eight million dollars are represented as being involved. The cities of New Orleans and Baltimore will be greatly benefited by this decision.

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y., Feb. 20, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era.

But sentiment is expressed here in Northern New York, as to the question with which Congress is now engaged. Indignation and sentiment are on every countenance and on every tongue. The Missouri Compromise repealed, and Slavery indefinitely extended over the virgin fields of the far Northwest! What next, Mr. Douglas? Is not the Ordinance of 1787 also unconstitutional, and the great States of Ohio, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, free by a mistake? Perhaps even this may yet be insisted on.

We are at the central point of Silver-grain for this State. There is much pride and aristocracy in our vicinity, and hundreds who have no sympathy with any of the so-called modern reforms; Conservatism and Humankind in great plenty, but a Douglas man—not one—not in all the populous, intelligent, proud, and wealthy county of Ontario.

Let us not despair of the Republic, even if this scheme is at present successful. Fill these regions with freemen at all events. Let them light the monster of wherever he may approach, and in their own good time begirt themselves with a wall of fire, over which, evil as diabolical as this will not attempt to pass. Mean time let us forever silence on the question of Slavery. Give it no peace, no rest, no place, until it is as unprofitable on earth as it is infamous in the eyes of Heaven.

[BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH.]

TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

Non-arrival of the Mails.—Freshet.

BALTIMORE, FEB. 27.—The Northern mail has failed to come to hand to-day. The train that left Baltimore at half past 7 last evening for Philadelphia, was forced to return, on account of the damage to the road by the freshet, between Perrymanville and Principio Bridge. The floods of yesterday are subsiding.

Arrival of the Isabel.

CHARLESTON, FEB. 25.—Havana dates inform us that it has been ordered that the Superintendency of the Treasury admit vessels loaded with coal, even if portion of the cargo consisted of other merchandise, to all the privileges of coal vessels.

The French fleet, Admiral Duchoane, is expected to order that the payment by slaves of a portion of their purchase money shall be recorded at the mortgage office. Several cargoes of slaves have been landed.

Markets.

NEW YORK, FEB. 27, 1 P. M.—Flour firm. Sales of 5,000 barrels State Brands, at \$8.44; Southern, at \$8.68. Wheat depressed. Corn—sales of 30,000 bushels mixed, at 89 cents; yellow, at 94 cents. Stocks unchanged. Cotton firmer.

BALTIMORE, FEB. 27.—Broadstuffs firmer. Flour—sales of 1,000 bbls. Howard Street, at \$7.50; City Mills held at \$7.50. Wheat—sales of 2,000 bushels white, at \$1.80; red, at \$1.75. Corn—sales of 30,000 bushels white, at 75 cents. Oats—sales at 50 a 53 cents per bushel.

BALTIMORE, FEB. 27, 2 1/2 P. M.—On Late "change City Mills flour sold at \$7.75; Howard Street at \$7.50 to \$7.62 1/2.

By later dates from Buenos Ayres, we learn that the rebels have been dispersed by Flores. Business good. Barque Victory, of Baltimore, ashore of Cape Santa Clara.

The tailors of Hamilton, Upper Canada, have "struck" against the sewing machine.

Dr. T. Clarke, the father of "Grace Greenwood," died in Beaver county, Pennsylvania, last Tuesday.

A certain amount of opposition is a great help to a man.

France, it is thought from present indications, will, in the course of a few years, raise in Africa cotton enough to supply all its own manufacturers.

The play of Uncle Tom's Cabin has been performed at the National Theatre the 228th time.

The Rhode Island Railroad bill has been referred to the Railroad Commissioners, by their majority.

UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

The second annual meeting of this Society was held at the Smithsonian Institution, in this city, on the 22d, 23d, and 24th of February, 1854; Hon. Marshall P. Wilder, of Massachusetts, President of the Society, in the chair; W. S. King, of Rhode Island, Recording Secretary; and Nathaniel P. Causin, of District of Columbia, Assistant Secretary.

Nineteen States were represented, and about one hundred members were present.

The President delivered his annual address; and, on motion of J. C. G. Kennedy, Corresponding Secretary, the President's address was referred to the Executive Committee for publication.

It was, on motion of Col. C. B. Calvert, of Maryland, agreed that committees of three members each be appointed for each subject under consideration, and to be named by the Chair.

The President informed the Convention that it was to Mr. Benson, of Maine, that the country was indebted for urging in the House of Representatives, the establishment of an Agricultural Bureau.

Mr. Denton Offutt, of Lexington, Kentucky, moved the appointment of a committee on Animal Physiology, and the general improvement in all respects of domestic animals.

Messrs. Calvert, Brown, of Pennsylvania, Earl, of Maryland, and B. Perley Poore, of Massachusetts, bore witness to Mr. Offutt's extraordinary influence over the horse, by means of some singular power.

A committee of three, consisting of Messrs. Brown, Earle, and French of Massachusetts, was appointed by the Chair.

The Committee on Agricultural Machinery was then announced by the Chair. It consists of Messrs. Dedrick, Musgrave of Ohio, and Professor Mapes.

An invitation from Mr. Glover to the Society, to visit his collection of models of fruits, at the Patent Office, was read; and it was accepted, and a committee appointed to examine the collection, consisting of General Worthington, Messrs. Berkman of New Jersey, Warder of Ohio, Munn of New York, and Richards of Massachusetts.

The Chair then offered for consideration the contents of two communications, confidentially committed to him. One was from Mr. Joel Hitchcock, of St. Lawrence county, New York, on the subject of a remedy for the potato rot; the other on the subject of a remedy for the devastations of the curculio on fruits, by some person whose name did not transpire. The object of the parties seemed to be, to get their remarks tested by the Society through committees of the same name, and reports made at the meeting of next year.

After much debate, in which Messrs. Brown, Worthington, Earle, W. S. King, Horsey, Landreth of Philadelphia, Lewis of Massachusetts, Mapes, Dedrick, B. Perley Poore, French, and Corey, participated, the communication of Mr. Hitchcock was referred to the Executive Committee, who were instructed to test the mode proposed, and to report at the next annual meeting.

The paper on the curculio was referred to a select committee, consisting of the President of the Society, and Messrs. Wilder, Brinkole of Pennsylvania, and Birckman of New Jersey.

Mr. Bradford, of Delaware, read a memorial to Congress, from citizens of Delaware, praying the interposition of Congress, either by purchase of one of the Chincina Islands or by negotiation with Peru, to put a stop to the effects of the operation of the Anglo-Peruvian monopoly, by which the price of guano has been raised and kept at the extravagant price of \$54 per ton.

A committee of five was appointed in relation to the matter, viz: Messrs. Bradford, Calvert, Brown, Burghwin of North Carolina, and Booth of Virginia.

On motion of Mr. J. C. G. Kennedy, it was ordered that it be made the duty of the committee on nominations to nominate a permanent editor of the journal of the society.

On the subject of introducing the Alpaca or Peruvian sheep into the United States, was read by Mr. Mann, of New York.

Papers collected by the Lighthouse Board were referred to by Prof. Henry, who made some interesting remarks on one of them, being a paper on the use and importance of Colza oil for burning.

An ear of corn was then exhibited by Mr. Henry, of Ohio, and a distribution of the papers was made by a member.

Professor Mapes, of New Jersey, exhibited and explained an improved sub-soil plough, invented by himself.

On motion of Mr. Bradford, of Delaware, the subject was referred to the Committee on Agricultural Implements.

Dr. J. A. Warder presented a quantity of Japan pines, and described their nature and value. They were introduced in the neighborhood of Cincinnati three years ago, and have been widely distributed. It is not a pea, nor a vine, but has a stiff woody stem; the leaves, however, are broad, and are greedily eaten by cattle; the fruit is very abundant, and occurs in short pods, containing two or three beans; these are oblong when green, but round when dry. They will not be valuable for table use when green, but are liked by most who have tried them boiled, or as soup, when ripe, in winter, and must prove of great value, especially in the Southern States, succeeding well on all soils in which they have been planted. Their great value will be as food for cattle; they are easily threshed out when ripe.

Prof. Fox, of Michigan, delivered his address on the important subject of extending and improving the education of the agricultural population of the United States, so as to elevate that vast majority of our people up to their proper level, and to bring a greater amount of intelligence to bear upon that important interest, the judicious cultivation of the soil.

A discussion here followed, embracing questions relating to theoretical and practical farming, experimental farms, the purchase of Mount Vernon for this purpose, an Agricultural Bureau or Department, &c. In this discussion, Messrs. French of Massachusetts, Calvert of Maryland, Benson of Maine, B. O. Taylor, Earle, Brown, J. A. King, Mapes, and John Jones of Delaware, participated.

Finally, on motion of Mr. Earle, the memorial of the Maryland State Agricultural Society, petitioning Congress to purchase Mount Vernon for an agricultural school, was taken up and read.

Mr. French, of Massachusetts, advocated the adoption of the resolution. It was carried, and Messrs. Blair of Maryland, Earle, Brown, King of New York, and French of Massachusetts, were appointed a committee to present it to Congress.

A motion of Mr. Causin, to refer the lecture of Professor Fox to the Executive Committee, for publication, was carried.

During the delivery of Professor Fox's address, the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior entered the hall, and were received with appropriate marks of respect; and during the discussion that followed they departed, the President first thanking the Society for its courtesy, and regretting that the demands of public business prevented his remaining to witness the proceedings of the Society.

The venerable G. W. P. Custis, Esq., being called on, addressed the society for upwards of half an hour in an eloquent and acceptable

manner. He recited circumstances which occurred in the early years of the century, connected with the rise of American manufactures, and dwelt earnestly upon the dignity and importance of agriculture.

Mr. Robbins, of Ohio, presented a memorial from citizens of that State, asking the countenance and patronage of the society to a cattle exhibition, to be held in September next, in Springfield, Clark county, Ohio. Referred to the Executive Committee.

The society passed a vote of thanks for the address, and ordered a written paper on the subject to be printed among their transactions.

Professor Mapes testified to the value of charcoal in this culture.

Dr. Warder spoke of the admirable effects of potash as a manure for the grape plant. It supplied sweetness, increased the size, and improved the flavor.

Mr. Darius Clagett, of the District of Columbia, gave the history of a Catawba vine, now in his possession, more than forty years old, the parent of the greater portion of the vines now in the country.

A resolution, which recommended a stone in the National Washington Monument, with a suitable inscription, was carried.

Mr. Brown, of Pennsylvania, presented his work on wool and hair.

Mr. Bradford, of Delaware, made a report on the guano trade, narrating the interview of the committee on the subject with Mr. Dudley Mann, Assistant Secretary of State. Hopes are entertained that arrangements may be made with Peru, by which the price of guano will be reduced.

Mr. Calvert, Prof. Mapes, Mr. Earle, Mr. Bradford, and Mr. Brown, spoke on the question.

The report was recommended.

Mr. Brown, of Pennsylvania, made a report from the committee appointed to investigate Mr. Denton Offutt's system of animal physiology.

Mr. Causin, who was associated with F. P. Blair, Esq., to examine and audit the accounts of the Treasurer, reported, (in the absence of Mr. Blair,) complimented their accuracy, and stated a balance of \$3,005 in favor of the Society. Of this, upwards of one thousand dollars have been contributed at the present meeting.

Mr. Benson read a bill now before a committee of Congress, creating an Agricultural Bureau.

Hon. Mr. Benson presented a resolution, in behalf of Mr. Meacham, of Vermont, that a National Exhibition of sheep be held in the course of the year, in the State of Vermont, at such time and place as the Agricultural Society of Vermont shall appoint. Carried.

Benj. Perley Poore, Esq., addressed the Society on the rise and progress of agriculture in the old world, and more particularly in the new.

On motion of Mr. Poore, it was resolved that a committee of three be appointed to collect facts and statistics illustrating the Indian and subsequent agricultural history of this Republic, embracing statistics, accounts of tools, and biographical sketches of noted farmers, and report to the Executive Committee in season for publication in the next report, if worthy. The committee are Messrs. R. P. Poore, W. S. King, and J. A. Warder.

A vote of thanks was tendered to him, and also a resolution of thanks to Professor Henry and other officers of the Smithsonian Institution, and to Mr. H. Hardy, the reporter; and the Society adjourned sine die.

A brief paragraph appeared in the Era last Friday, concerning a great meeting in Boston of the National or Webster Whigs and others, to protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The following account of it will be read with interest.—Ed. Era.

BOSTON, FEB. 23, 1854.

To the Editor of the National Era.

The Whigs of Boston have just held a large and